

Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Juvenile Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
1	March 31, 2004	<i>Three-Year Annual Report: Bibb Co. (Georgia) Juvenile Drug Court Program</i>	Program description; description of participants; recidivism for 53 graduates and 43 youth terminated	96 youth who left program (53 graduated; 43 terminated) plus 45 current participants	n/a
2	February 2004	<i>Evaluation of the Kalamazoo County Juvenile Drug Treatment Court Program: October 1, 2002 – September 30, 2003: Year 6. By David J. Hartmann, Ph.D. and Paul Gregory, M.A., Western Michigan University</i>	Reviewed 51 participants in Year 6 of program, making comparisons, where applicable, with participants during previous 5 years of program operation.	51 participants entering program in Year 6, comparing them where applicable with prior program participants.	Control group established during Year one continued to grow during each year.
3	March 2003	<i>Summary Report of Virginia's Drug Court Programs.</i> Office of the Supreme Court of Virginia and Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services. Author Not Provided	Individuals in the Virginia drug court program between November 1995 and December 2002 were analyzed.	217 Virginians admitted to the felony drug court program	Control group matched by age, race, gender, educational level, and offense history
4	May 5, 2002	<i>From Whether to How Drug Courts Work: Retrospective Evaluation of Drug Courts in Clark County (Las Vegas) and Multnomah County (Portland), [Oregon].</i> John S. Goldkamp; Michael D. White; Jennifer B. Robinson.	Study focuses primarily on evaluating adult drug courts in Portland, Oregon and Las Vegas, Nevada but provides summary review of Clark Co. Juvenile Drug Court.	Studies all 145 juveniles entering the Clark Co., Nevada juvenile drug court in 1999	N/A
5	June 10, 2001	<i>A Preliminary Outcome Evaluation of North Dakota's Juvenile Drug Court: Recidivism Analysis.</i> Kevin M. Thompson, Dept. of Sociology. North Dakota State University. [two drug courts: E. Central Jud District and NE Central Jud District]	Outcome evaluation of participants in juvenile drug courts in E. Central Jud District and NE Central Jud District	32 Participants for at least two months in juvenile drug courts in E. Central Jud District and NE Central Jud District for the period May 2000 – May 2001	Juveniles referred to court from 1995 - 1997
6	2000	<i>Beckham County Juvenile Drug Court: Phase II Analysis and Evaluation.</i> right, David. Clymer, Bob.	Beckham County Juvenile Drug Court graduates were monitored at 6,12, and 18 months after graduation.	Beckham County Juvenile Drug Court graduates were monitored at 6, 12, and 18 months after graduation.	Beckham County's Graduated Sanctions Program graduates were monitored at 6, 12, and 18 months after graduation.
7	February 1999	<i>Evaluation of the Orange County Juvenile Substance Abuse Treatment Court Program</i> Applegate, Brandon. Reuter, David. McCarthy, Bernard. Santana, Shannon.	Youths processed by the DC Program with a follow-up evaluation of 180 days	100 juveniles were admitted to the drug court program between August 20, 1997 and October 31, 1998.	N/A
8	September 18, 2003	<i>Evaluation of Maine's Statewide Juvenile Drug Treatment Court Program. Fourth Year Outcome Evaluation Report.</i> Donald F. Anspach, Andrew S. Ferguson, Laura L. Phillips. College of Arts and Sciences. University of Southern Maine	246 youth admitted to Maine's Juvenile Drug Treatment Court studied;	6 juvenile drug courts in Maine (York, Cumberland, Androscoggin, Kennebec, Penobscott and Sagadahoc Cos.)	Matched comparison group

Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluations of Juvenile Drug Court Programs: 2000 - present. Compiled by the BJA Drug Court Clearinghouse Project. School of Public Affairs. American University. Updated. February 11, 2005

Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Juvenile Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
9	March 1998	<i>Evaluation of the Juvenile Drug Court Diversion Program [New Castle County, Delaware]</i> Miller, Marsha. Scocas, Evelyn. O'Connell, John. N/A	Juveniles admitted into the diversion program in Delaware were monitored during program treatment.	144 juveniles were admitted into the Diversion Program in Summer 1997	90 juveniles that had been arrested for misdemeanor drug possession in New Castle County during the first half of 1995. Equivalent criminal histories were accounted for.
10	December 2004	<i>Evaluation of Virginia's Drug Treatment Court Programs (Phase I). Office of the Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia</i>	Process and outcome study of Virginia's adult and juvenile drug courts	371 youth admitted to Virginia juvenile drug courts	n/a

Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Juvenile Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
1	March 31, 2004	Reviewed program information regarding participant demographics, drug use history, recidivism, and other info.	<u>53 graduates</u> : 14 (26%) rearrested, half (7) for drug related offenses 43 terminated: 24 rearrested (56%), 9 for drug-related offenses;	1 graduate (1.8%) convicted of a drug related offense; 5 (11.6%) of those terminated were convicted of a drug related offense	n/a	Cost savings of \$ 28,200.00 for pretrial detention costs that would have been incurred until arraignment hearing. (\$ 200 for 2 days x 141 participants)	
2	February 2004	Analyzed characteristics and performance of 52 youth who entered drug court in Year 6 of its operation, making comparisons, where applicable, with participants of prior years		For participants who had been out of the program for at least one year, there was a decrease in the total number of adjudicated crimes between the pre-program year (180), the in-program period (reduced to 69 – 62%)), and the post-program year (reduced to 54-70%)	n/a	Recidivism for participants following one year similar to recidivism of probationer control group – both declined significantly; considered to reflect greater likelihood of success predicted for control group	
3	March 2003	N/A	-12.5% DC -55.6% Control Recidivism is defined as re-arrest.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Recidivism rates for the individual drug courts are shown.
4	May 5, 2002	-tracked rearrests of juveniles during 12 months following their enrollment	2/3 of youth rearrested for new offense within 12 months of program enrollment	N/A	12 months following enrollment		

Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Juvenile Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
5	June 10, 2001	Tracked recidivism for 32 participants enrolled in two juvenile drug courts for at least two months for a one year period	16% of juv. Drug court parties recidivated within one year compared with 57% of comparison group		12 months following enrollment (for participants with a minimum of 2 months participation)	Also found that recidivism rate of juv drug court participants was 19% lower than recidivism rate of juveniles referred for first time alcohol violation (2,016 during 1995-97 period), although juv drug court participants had average of 3+ prior referrals, and significantly lower than recidivism rates for 112 juveniles for first offense drug charges; no significant differences for program completers vs. noncompleters though only 11 graduates at the time of the study.	Separate report addresses impact of program participation on school achievement (August 12, 2002), which noted: (1) average GPA increased from 1.78 to 2.08 in two quarters of participation; class periods missed reduced from 73 to 53; and many qualitative improvements, including one student elected to student council; one achieved perfect grade point average; another increased very low ACT score to 82 nd percentile; and a few considering or going to college
6	2000	N/A	6 months -33% DC -33% Comp. 12 months -44% DC -33% Comp. 18 months -55% DC -55% Comp. - Recidivism was measured as re-arrest.	N/A	6 months, 12 months, and 18 months	N/A	N/A
7	February 1999	Individuals were compared within the program using different variables in order to draw conclusions.	180 days -15% overall -11% graduates -21% non-graduates Recidivism defined as re-arrest.	N/A	180 days	- Weakness in case processing- slow and understaffed. - 82% of graduates had “improved rate of functioning”	N/A

Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Juvenile Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
8	November 3, 2003	Traced 246 youth admitted to Maine's juvenile Drug Court and compared to matched comparison group, resulting in study of 105 drug court participants; 30 graduates; and 105 comparison groups	Fewer Juvenile drug court participants arrested than control group and graduates least likely to re-offend; juvenile drug court participants less likely than control group to be rearrested for alcohol or drug related offenses, or for felonies or violent crime			<p>Rate of in-program positive drug tests for juvenile drug court participants was lower (24%) than rate of positive drug tests for other youth in Maine's cjs system (35%)</p> <p>Participants who are more frequently tested have lower rates of positive drug tests</p>	Cost of juvenile drug court is \$23.83/day ; cost for 64 participants was "\$853,379 compared with 760,161 for traditional adjudication (93,218 more for the juvenile drug court BUT if increased to 90 clients, would be 44,877 less for the drug court (1,207,579) than traditional process (1,252,456)
9	March 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Initial non-compliance did not result in termination from the program. - Non-compliance during the program was analyzed only. 	During Treatment -21% DTC -30% Comp. - Recidivism is defined as a new arrest.	N/A	During treatment, 6,9, and 12 months after treatment	Marijuana was the drug of choice.	N/A
10	December 2004	Review of drug court info and post program rearrest info	<p>Average statewide recidivism rates of juvenile drug court graduates is 12.6% (felonies) and 12.6% (Misdemeanors).</p> <p>Average statewide recidivism rates of juvenile nongraduates (those who withdrew or were expelled from the programs) is 26.9% (felony) and 11.9% (misdemeanor).</p>	n/a	n/a	Significantly lower recidivism for juvenile drug court participants if they complete the treatment program and graduate	n/a